

1 Oct 87

## Political Courage

Harry Wills & JFK's "Professors": must, courage to defy majority  
of their home constituents:  
for what? - principle?

- when majority is wrong, is error  
(presumably, for JFK, most  
of the time: elitist)

or: in support of pariah, partisan  
committed / concerned minority?!

Does he have any cause of  
opposing the latter - which  
really threatens his reputation,  
influence  
prestige  
or total income?

Reverend's "time and condition of employment"  
as Pres' aim, as for others.

His opinion: Pres' purpose of them ... is (always) good  
for country.

Eluding Principles:  
... to keep jobs.

Yet to pursue certain "ideals, <sup>legal</sup> fundamental principles" of  
a job may be to risk losing it, or losing influence,  
resources to do it well in other respects!

- If a sheriff upholds certain laws  
against certain people (property taxes; "rights" of mid

- If the Catholic Church <sup>or Foundation</sup> opposes the good (who good  
acts wisely) and loses tax status or property  
or "rights" ...

Reverend: end of  
Christ, Nov 50;  
Christ Handed, early  
attached to SD; to CVN,  
centros...

- To be truly "realistic" about certain aspects of  
any or environment or "energy, self" may be to  
be seen as deserting, disloyal, unpatriotic, passive /  
cheerless...



Atlantic Charter? Canak (self-determination?)

end of colonies

independence

vs. hierarchy of nations

"rights" of intervention

violently violated

Four Freedoms: Of Speech

Of Religion

From Want (social status, bonds.)

From Fear (vs. race and race, threats)

(of police?)

of oppression?

risk to by-standers

of annihilation? (prevented/omitted)

(Hypocrisy; yet, valuable, valid aims...)

+ "paths, ways" (instruments, means)

Duties of How, Constraints on How

Robert: Peter Steinfeld on Nicaragua

"Vs centres, but..."

"Social total., destroyed economy..."

"Best one can hope for is like Mexico:"

(Robert: Corrupt? Inequality?

Sickness, illiteracy?)

Steinfeld: "Apathy from social indifference..."

(+ misrep. from US...)

Defines human rights totally in terms of

political rights



1 Oct 87

- If you want peace  
"prepare for war" [alliance of what kinds of war? Result?  
What kind of war? Supported by military  
against whom? American, other  
Is this prep likely to provoke  
a war?  
In offensive / aggressive / preventive  
warfare?

Prepare to: avoid result? (Romans)

to: finish  
counter-attack  
escalate  
"pacify" / occupy / govern?  
avoidable result  
prompt / driven

At what cost?

to saving

(to "prep" or benefit: to cycle

to R+B

to MIC

"Forest Fire Management"

"Crisis (Management  
and) Management"

(Warning Not Reasonable Cost/Risk)

BRINKSMANSHIP  
Phases of Esc.

Does war prep

CRISES

Managed in 50's  
early '60's of New York:  
reunion in threat, F.A.

Was CII a "crisis" for (front, rear)

Loss, before US blockade?

(Were they "disparate"?)

Did they anticipate poss. of  
front, violent response of US?

disparate  
- require one to perceive / define others as "enemies"  
i.e. stimulate fear + hatred in oneself, one's folk?  
- interfere with other needs, props, rights?

(perhaps necessary to "prepare" or its enjoyment,  
- interfere with other personally activities: rituals, trade.  
- cause fear in others (Others: They)

and counter-prop, reduce stability

(lead to "loss of control")

(loss of, e.g. "ability to avoid

going to war, starting war:

to avoid situations that lead to  
war, capital war...)

(Wf) Crises: Sarajevos...

Long  
CII  
Skylab  
U-2

Queen  
DBP

Korea

Tahiti Gulf

(gain ambiguity)

- commit or disavow one

to perceive, or respond to  
certain (undeterminable, with certainty)

as "crises," causes hell, "threats"

or requiring one to threaten, or punish  
maintain image of authority,

obvious  
crises  
(not, end of  
Crisis;  
Kle bank;  
Pearl Harbor  
WWII  
Korean "mob"  
in WWII

(1st attack: not a crisis? 2nd "crisis"?)



I was, in 1960<sup>-61</sup>, a disciple of Munsell's: I thought of myself as applying his insights and perspective — in the service of Presidential Power, as he advocated —

(the / States, before JFK/MCN)

along with Schelling's (& mine) &

all sorts  
of matters!

I started with Model I (your thing) (Schelling)

learned Model II from Marshall (and in the Pentagon & Pacific)

Model III from Munsell, & Cuba II

(copy all these, e.g. to war plans!)

But in 1964, in Crisis Studies, I discovered, as well, the question: What is it a crisis?

and discovered President's personal status — as a pol & job-holder and place-holder in history books, and person of emotions,

and learned to question REX implicit axiom:

"What's good for the Pres is good for the country, the world."

Model I (Schell I, II?) in VN, 1964-65-67...

More so in VN...

Above all, in 1967 study of 1961 in VN: Pres as criminal, vs. Model III — Quezine Myth.

Came to see III as cover for Pres, misbehavior, apology/defense...

In '64-'65<sup>-67</sup>, found fear of public, "losing VN" — domestic politics. (Bastis Goldwater...)

RT Craziness; serious lying...

(still, saw it as: MCN; C&V;...

"If a new Pres of knew"... but, learned of JFK in 1961...

I told N; but in 1969 I saw him going on/in, "for no compelling reason internal to him or external to US"; and model all PP  
→ MOD IV



Each model has some strengths, some unique contributions,  
each is needed;

so is Model IV;

and it is a bridge to more complex models of domestic  
policy, including Marxist ones <sup>classes</sup> (RC, MNCs, as main  
specified "actors,"

- though

Model I - blending domestic + foreign policies, econ, foreign trade  
+ minerals, money (see Paul Ford, 1968; 1971; 1973...)  
oil, crisis

(What do Pres' have in common?)

Who "are" they?

Who picks the nominees; the winners...

see MR on VN (e.g. in 1970... <sup>WN...</sup> Endless War)  
Chomsky  
Kobko

Model VI - include Cuba, Vietnam, TW;  
Arabia, Africa...  
Europe... (poststone  
(to explain how US policies can act,  
how problems are prevented  
what are "real" options

Cuba II, Models IV (V + VI)

"Q.M." 20 years later see there  
(+ Schles; + Kille + Bitto)



Another reason Model IV is needed, but is avoided, denied:

It strips the Pres of "plausible denial" cover of Model III, makes him accountable for policies that are specially culpable: not only reckless, and "politically motivated"

but: murders: assassinations

terrorism

support of dictators, tyrants

distortion of democracy

torture regimes

genocidal "

+ illegal

wildly unjust regimes

unconstitutional

immoral

(In models I-IV-III, there are roots of

- other, "independent" regimes

- at worst, with CIA bias

- or "rogue" CIA involvement

- or rogue CIA ops

- or other agencies' rivalry or competition

or opportunism

- or bad intell, advice, implementation

projection - of  
action, or fault -  
away from Pres  
(or US)

all to be curbed by (a) better info, advice to Pres ("efforts":  
research studies Pool)

research

(b) more power to Pres

(c) in some cases, better Pres

(For me, the full story, somewhat in Crisis Study (Ske)

now is 1967 study of 1961, the LBJ rule in '68, N in '69,

PP study of 1945-61...

(My understanding of how evolved: rejection of Model III: Pres/entire  
rather than Pres/entire... influences

see my  
"Q.M."



- Why does "JFK School Paradigm" exclude domestic pol. influences (costs, interests, considerations)?

+ "ideology" (Gallb)

Became decisions to kill or risk killing (+ dying - of US citizens) are "supposed to be made"

"legitimized, justified, and"

on grounds of

1) saving lives: preventing the killing or dying of (many, more) others (esp. Americans) or lowering the risk of this,

or (2) saving people from some "misadventure, oppression, tyranny," or the risk of it.

Other purposes, like <sup>3)</sup> keeping the President in office, <sup>4)</sup> preserving his prestige + influence (readers there are plenty - not w/ to Pres - directly committed to his above) (without a significant, "suspicious," admission of other motives), protecting Party prestige, helping economy, helping special economic interests, "preventing" (avoiding recession/depression... e.g. in a TW country, or TW in general) international trade, "protecting"

any be important + legitimate, but not <sup>legitimate</sup> as basis for manipulating risk of war + peace, life or death, [though, in reality, they are commonly causal, perhaps predominant].

distorted, "ideological," distorted, <sup>rigid,</sup> unwholesome beliefs and values - esp. if (!) they serve a status quo minority of interest groups and power relations

Ex: as all "paradigms" do, <sup>requiring</sup> including scientific and including models I-III]



"Have a hard ring to them," suggest criticism of the Pros and his Best & Brightest.

So both Hall's & my version of Model IV, in 1970, was less acceptable then, and now, to those who find Model IV "cognitive adequate".

Model IV is much less likely to become a "bandwagon" within elite academic circles.

Yet it could be recognized as a hypothesis — with almost too much evidence to be dismissed — says I guess — as "extreme, radical, idealistic".

[Note: Model IV, central on Pros, is my focus, not "MIC," as Julie supposed.]

I have only 20 references MIC or MNCs tend to ignore Pros and Panter/Electra, along with bureaucracy; just as BPM neglects Pros as effective cause, along with outside influences on him).

← Angel of History: Walter Benjamin (Jan Narin)

I see CW history as a series of catastrophes, over-catastrophes, and <sup>preparation for</sup> future, ~~disaster~~ catastrophes — with Pros as (a big) part of the problem, not just "an eye for eye & grandeur."

Small  
VN, Jan  
also SU, China,  
Congress, media,  
public, courts

[How/why did REX become so speaking a celebration of Prichard, like Hugh Lidy? Love for host?]

Center: no "October surprise" raid or invasion (any thanks to Vane? Was he still in Aug 80 No?)

But give credit where credit is due: 30 major back-draws, averting of catastrophes: including for Reagan (who gets credit why with him?): getting out of Lebanon; not invading ~~the~~ Myanmar; (INF against); not invading Cuba, or Libya

(along with Cetas: Nicaragua, El Salvador, Lebanon raid, Lebanon, Challenger SDI, attack on ABM, no kidnapping, abductees — all remarkably creditable.

and to  
Congress on:  
Lebanon exit,  
- hits on  
SAT, SDI, MX,  
1, stands  
Persian Gulf



Oct 1 87

Notion of rape in strike ("instead of invasion")  
was been brained\* (Adrian, et al)

"Myer SU with acknowledge"!

Have assets from for invasion?

Have justify not warring SU/Cuba?

not completely allies?

" " regarding difficulty for Turkish mines?

" " "either that" ? saying, "accusing"  
but "right"

Those who wanted to avoid invasion  
(Tolson; ~~Fulbright~~? JFK, McG B?; ~~Shaw~~)  
should have seen that strike was a prelude  
(as Ockerson's "surgical" strike)

What if? What if SU claimed right to replace mines?  
Or attacked Turkish?

Or explosion / documented Morgue! Or Cuba died!

(Wf didn't th ?!)

[Did th ?!]

\* No parallel - history - (till TG, RT - with

Adrian: Blockade of SU not

(see mining of Keifeng  
'64, '72)

ult. (see '89)

Brian Wilton!

- only, till R raid a Kharkov  
(Soviet raid on Irish vector)

(Soviet raid on Tunisia; or a Libyan)

assass attack on Fallalbach = assass raid - Kharkov  
(Khark Meapitulate?)

"R: "Don't  
know - have PDS; Shaw / MacMichael  
authorized put up on Woodward file,

on "assass" issue.

others?

R denial

see Chris Poncha, Quintero, to

Coyne; Hearings; Call McMichael, Wilton

Territorial (Bush connection: CA)

Hates Wilton. Pastora, Shank. Chris

Reduction? "Ob. 40"



Cuba with:

- Roger Morris (see N/HAK in perpetrator  
of other threats, CW policy)

- Edward Abner

-(Robert Schen)

- Betts

- Martin Amis

- James Pines

- Randy Fausberg

- Mike Klare

- Ruth Adams

- Ned Libow

- Mark Treadwell

- Des Ball (look up, "Blind Men...")

- Sherry (get back)

- Chao

- Kayser

- Rathjens

- IPS - Baum, Barozzi,

- Sanders

MacA new paradigm: beyond "determined" paradigm  
on risks not recognized of "Det Model"  
"US/SU"  
/ /  
see as...

Aronson

Eisen

Kelbow  
Jenkins

\* Many factors of risk can admittedly not be determined;  
not reduced by policies of "determined"; and any are  
endemic to " " " ; or their probable  
reduction, solutions. Are they less important than what  
is determined? Does policy + paradigm of det reduce risk, or  
balance? Define a "whole" risk-reduction program, including TW, trade

Who are perhaps defense advisors?

Program? New paradigm?

Proposals to constrain Pres?!

"crisis" -  
avoidance/  
negotiation  
(not,  
"worst-case",  
update to...)



Det <sup>sup</sup> I, II, III...

Model I, II, III... (of, say,  
Type I Det)

SDI I, II, III...

(\*Model\* must be specified  
for both/all sides in a  
confrontation. Thus, after Mod I  
is used for Soviets, III or IV for  
US)

Type I, Model II...

Type II, Model IV...

School I, II, III

Stability I, II,

Stability (based on, of) Conditional Instability

Control (of opponent) of Threat of Losing Control...

As Blight says, JFK may have been tempted/repelled,  
desperately, to make Threat of Losing Control / Ult.

Means of 1) fear of losing control, if K were  
not deterred from 2) firing on missiles near

(b) continuing to make missiles

Det RKK really say missiles — operational ("next step";

must be out starting in 24 hrs,

or must stop work on them?!

(K got out because of

threat to recon!)

or  
not (c) hitting Turkish missiles  
(or Berlin)

and if US hit Cuban missiles  
after 2) only occurred

(Hys: This was a goal of offing  
private threats! "No need to

hit Turkish missiles." But this

might have made strike on Turk

missiles look safer to SU! As

would de-fusing this! (Was

JFK missing retal on Turkish missiles,

rather than Berlin?)

2/alternatives: Threat... kill... loss of election





7

Aug 5, Midway Bay 1986

Crater to Prairie - Margaret Ellery



Was Fullbright or Russell up for  
re-election in '62? Did they fear  
loss of control of Senate?

and our internal Reps: McCon, Dillon,  
Twitt

<sup>Reps</sup>  
JFK forced a thumb from Klatsky & Caplan  
in Nov 62 - at 64 - and perhaps JCS, Armed Forces,  
& Navies etc - if he "lost," ignored that, treated...

Required to submit hst (+ advisors, JCS)  
from <sup>Reps</sup> McA, in action of Nov 50 (?)  
or 1952, if the change McA's order in Nov 50!  
"State - the last - definitist - Traitor - <sup>many</sup> convent - Re..."

(When hst find McA, he had been discredited by defeat  
Did McA want China attack?  
What did he put risk at?)

like Wasty at Jit (see my revelations!)  
Even so, McA gave hst thumb...

and McA,  
after Korea

Pange!

(Why was Korea attack a crisis for US, in Nov '50?!)  
(Analyze China lobby: including dope, money...)

Influence of a parentage / ideology, (including School III,  
multiculturalism)  
shared by Pres, officials, military, clerics, unions,  
elites, media, business, courts, business  
and large parts of public  
(see Yankelovich...)

(Who does not show: many / most women,  
blacks,  
poor;

many youth  
hardcore

some in rich elite



MAN agreed with me - did he not? - on Model IV  
in 1970 at RAND, vs. Model III  
(Moonster did; Halbrook, I think...)

got in his book - BPM,  
and now, - "Melba Follies"

Pres is still missing - it is "burrows"  
was "burial in thorns", not Presidents who  
under the...

and solution is to give Pres more control!  
(cut at VCS).

Wf?

ditto, I guess, MCN & MCGB are still  
Presidents' men (Kewen?)

(Is Mont interested in one man creek at that?  
after R)